DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 361 FL 010 222

AUTHOR Faerch, Claus
TITLE "Complexification" and "Communicative Potential" - Two Basic Notions in the Description of Learner Language.
PUB DATE Sep 78
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Internationales Kolloquium uber Fragen der Kontrastiven Linguistik und der Ubersetzungswissenschaft (Trier, Saarbruchen, Germany, September 25-30, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communicative Competence (Languages); Comparative Analysis; Complexity Level; *Contrastive Linguistics; Discourse Analysis; English; English (Second Language); Error Analysis (Language); *Language Instruction; Language Learning Levels; *Language Proficiency; Language Research; *Linguistic Performance; Research Methodology; *Second Language Learning; Verbal Communication
IDENTIFIERS Danish; *Interlanguage

ABSTRACT

This study focused on linguistic analyses used in the PIF Project (Project in Error Analysis, Interlanguage Studies and Contrastive Linguistics), an ongoing study of learner language and a project in foreign language pedagogy. For the project, 120 Danish learners of English were divided into 12 groups representing different Danish educational levels. Testing materials, several of which were computerized for multiple linguistic analyses, consisted of an oral and a written summary of a film, essays in English and Danish on set topics, and a video-taped 20 minute conversation with a native speaker of English. Analyses used included performance analysis, an expansion of traditional error analysis to include correct aspects of learner language, which can be broken down into: (1) linguistic performance analysis, dealing with phonological, syntactic, lexical and pragmatic properties of native or foreign language samples, and especially with the notion of "complexification," a process leading to increased correctness; and (2) communicative performance analysis, a measurement of communicative potential. Also used in the project were developmental performance analysis, which deals with stages of foreign language development, and contrastive performance analysis, i.e., comparing the learner's performance in his native and foreign languages or comparing the learner's and the native speaker's performance of the language in question. Implications for further interlanguage studies and pedagogical research are discussed. (MHP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED168361

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Claus Faerch
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

"Complexification" and "communicative potential" - two basic notions in the description of learner language

Claus Færch
The PIF Project
Department of English
University of Copenhagen

FL010222

Paper presented at the "Internationales Kolloquium über Fragen der kontrastiven Linguistik und der Übersetzungswissenschaft, Trier/Saarbrüchen, September 25-30, 1978".

"Complexification" and "communicative potential" - two basic notions in the description of learner language[1]

Claus Færch
The PIF Project
Department of English
University of Copenhagen

1. Traditional contrastive linguistics

In this paper I do not intend to discuss the contribution of traditional contrastive linguistics (CL)[2] to other areas of research, theoretical or applied. First, because my main objective is to describe the theoretical framework on which the PIF project[3] is based - and as will be seen, the project is not a contrastive analysis project in the traditional sense of the term. Secondly, because the last decade has seen such a multitude of critical assessments and reassessments, attacks and exculpations that the issues in question have by now been very well documented.[4] So without giving any supporting argumentation, let me merely state what I consider two basic facts about CL:

1) CL is primarily a theoretical, linguistic discipline, constituting part of the more general area known as comparative linguistics.

2) Results from CL can be utilized in what is traditionally termed 'applied research'[5] such as foreign language pedagogy (FLP) or translation science. However, it is a well-established fact that applied research can very rarely be reduced to the application of just one basic research discipline (cf. Mackey 1973). Hence for FLP, linguistics is but one relevant discipline - and CL is not the only relevant type of linguistic research.

2. Foreign language pedagogy

The PIF project is a project in foreign language pedagogy. The term is used with reference to research whose objective is the description, analysis and explanation of aspects of foreign language learning and teaching, in addition to the subsequent development of new curricula, teaching materials, teaching

methods, tests, etc.[6] Ideally, this type of research should be performed by research teams including at least sociologists, psychologists and linguists in addition to foreign language teachers. Unfortunately, the departmental structure of many traditional universities impedes such interdisciplinary research, and the PIF project clearly illustrates this: all the ten researchers who are involved in the project are linguists and teachers of English. Hence the present research activities of the project are predominantly linguistic.

3. Linguistic description and analysis in foreign language pedagogy

At the risk of oversimplifying the issues, I suggest that we distinguish between two major types of linguistic research within FLP:

1) Descriptions of *la langue* as such, e.g. descriptions of English, Polish or German. Such descriptions *may* be made on a comparative basis, in which case they are referred to as (traditional) contrastive analysis.

2) Descriptions of the linguistic *performance* of language users, including interlanguage users. These descriptions, too, can be compared in various ways, to be further discussed presently.

Descriptions of the first type have been the main concern of several contrastive analysis projects. Results from such studies can be utilized in pedagogical grammars (cf. Marton 1974), whereas the application to syllabus construction is more problematic (Howatt 1974). The PIF project is presently engaged in the second type of linguistic research. In the following, I shall describe the methodological principles on which this research is based and mention some of the project's ongoing activities. But first, a brief outline of the project's research objectives.

4. PIF - research objectives

1) A description of the performance in English of Danish learners, representing 12 different levels within the educational system.[7] The description will be based on data produced in semi-naturalistic situations out of the class-room. In addition to describing

select phonological, morphological and syntactic aspects of the performance we intend to pay some attention to the areas of lexis, discourse and fluency.

2) A description of developmental patterns in the learners' performance, on the basis of comparisons between the performance in English of learners from different levels, comparisons between the learners' performance in Danish and in English, and, finally, comparisons between the learners' performance in English and the performance of native speakers of English in comparable situations.

3) An assessment of the communicative potential of different aspects of learner language.

These research objectives bear a strong similarity to research objectives within interlanguage studies, and it is hoped that the project will eventually contribute to a clarification of some of the basic issues within this field of research. One such issue is the hypothesis, forwarded by Corder (1978b), that learner language develops along a "developmental continuum", and that progress in foreign language learning represent a complexification process. This hypothesis will be further discussed below.

5. Types of performance analysis

The term 'performance analysis'[8] is here used with reference to analyses of spontaneously produced language. The term is neutral with respect to the opposition between native and foreign languages, although it is most frequently used with reference to the analysis of performance in a foreign language. In these cases, the term can be considered an expansion of traditional error analysis, which only focussed on specific areas of learner language. Performance analysis consists of error analysis supplemented with analyses of correct aspects of learner language.

The term performance analysis inevitably calls to mind the Chomskyan opposition between competence and performance. It could be argued that by introducing the notion of performance analysis into FLP, we are putting the clock back to the pre-Chomskyan era in theoretical linguistics. I am not particularly worried by

this, and for two reasons:

1) We know very little about the relevance of a competence-performance distinction with respect to foreign languages, although a good deal of research is presently being undertaken with a view to elucidating the concept of "L_2knowledge" (Bialystok & Fröhlich 1977, Krashen 1977).

2) Even in the native language, the opposition between competence and performance is far from well-defined, and the methodological problems associated with carrying out competence descriptions by intuitional methods have become increasingly clear in recent years.

By making performance analyses, we describe what we actually find in learners' performance. On the basis of these analyses, we can then construct hypotheses about the learners' foreign language "competence". In this phase, where we move from the product level to the process level, it will no doubt be necessary to supplement our performance analysis results with results from elicitation methods and with introspective evidence.[9]

Having established the notion of performance analysis, let us now consider two types of performance analysis. In linguistic performance analysis, the focus is on the phonological, syntactic, lexical and pragmatic properties of a sample of native or foreign language, whereas communicative performance analyses assess how successful this linguistic system actually is for communication. Within linguistic performance analysis, one of the basic notions is "complexification". Within communicative performance analysis, the notion of "communicative potential" is of considerable significance.

Complexification refers to the processes in for instance language acquisition, language learning or the creolization of pidgins which lead to more complex types of language. Hence a theory of language learning which states that language learning is a complexification process (e.g. Corder 1978b) is vacuous without a specification of 'linguistic complexity'. Unfortunately there does not exist just one notion of linguistic complexity, but several (Bartsch 1973), and often these notions are rather

ill-defined and tend to confuse linguistic and cognitive complexity - as was probably the case in Bernstein's description of the two codes. If we look at the way complexification is used in creolization studies, we find Sankoff and Laberge in their studies of Neo-Melanesian mention the development of obligatory tense markers, the increase in redundancy, morphophonemic reduction and reduction in primary stress as examples of the creolization process (Sankoff & Laberge 1974). If we transfer characteristics of this sort to a language learning situation, it means that complexification to some extent represents a process leading to increasing correctness. Although it is often the case that language learning leads to more and more correct types of interlanguage, as measured against a target language norm, it does not seem to be the case that Danish learners of English follow a path towards the goal which resembles a complexification process as described e.g. by Sankoff and Laberge. Just to take a few examples, Danish learners of English seem to accept redundancy in English in those cases where Danish is redundant (e.g. obligatory tense markers even in the context of temporal adverbial expressions), whereas they have difficulty in learning those areas in which there is no corresponding redundancy in Danish (e.g. use of <u>be</u> with the expanded present tense, where the main verb is considered finite[10]; not to mention the verbal s-suffix). Evidence of this sort runs counter to theories which claim that all learners, irrespective of native language, follow approximately the same paths when learning the same foreign language. There does seem to be a fair amount of evidence in favour of relativistic theories of foreign language complexification, taking into consideration learners' native language (see also Wode 1978).

As mentioned, the description of interlanguage development could focus on errors as a convenient point of departure, but it would also have to deal with non-errors. Needless to say, it would be totally unrealistic to aim at complete performance analyses of learner language - even in research in child language acquisition linguists have had to focus on a number of linguistic phenomena rather than produce the complete 'grammars' which were often mentioned as a goal in the early stages of TG inspired research.

But in addition to linguistic analyses along these lines, as e.g. analyses of the tense system, of deixis, or of verbal complementation, we have other ways of analysing learner language at our disposal, viz. various statistically based measures such as length of T-units (Hunt 1970), type/token ratios, NP complexity and length of the preverbal element.

When we describe language phonologically, syntactically and lexically, we describe it in isolation from the communicative situation. This is what many linguists in this centure have done, and it certainly makes things much neater if you ignore the communicative aspects of language. It is a sad fact that learner language is particularly exposed to this misconception, for the simple fact that it is rarely used for genuine conversation in the classroom. This makes it even more important for researchers to describe pragmatic features of learner language, and to assess its "communicative potential". Recent years have seen some promising studies of interlanguage discourse (Hatch 1978, Peck 1978), and discourse analysis will no doubt have a significant contribution to make to linguistic performance analysis.

In describing the communicative potential of learner language we assess the quality of learner language relative to

1) the learners' communicative needs in the foreign language
2) the effects learner language can have on interlocutors.

As regards learner needs, the question to consider is to what extent the learner's foreign language acts as a barrier to his or her communication in the foreign language, i.e., in what ways learners reduce their messages because their interlanguage is insufficient as a vehicle for communication. We are very far from being able to answer this question. First of all, we do not know very much about learner needs - work such as the Threshold Level (van Ek 1975) is only a crude beginning. Secondly, we know very little about the relationship between communicative intent and linguistic complexity. How much can be communicated by means of a simple type of language? How much does linguistic complexity, given such a notion, increase our ability to communicate? Thirdly, could learners be taught to expand their resources for communication in other ways than by learning more of the foreign language,

e.g. by learning to use various productive communication strategies?

The second aspect of "communicative potential" has to do with the effect learner language has on interlocutors, native speakers of the foreign language or others. Here, one possible distinction is that between comprehensibility and irritation (Johansson 1975). Although a fair number of tolerance tests have been carried out over the last ten years, many of these have been very artificial, and it is difficult to judge to what extent the results obtained can be transferred to genuine communicative situations. Within the PIF project, a pilot study has been completed in which native speakers of English were asked to judge extracts of learners' spoken language on semantic differential scales, giving information about content, personality and language (Albrechtsen, Henriksen & Færch MS).

Linguistic and communicative performance analyses represent alternative - though closely interrelated - ways of analysing a sample of learner language. However, it is necessary to supplement these descriptions with comparisons of basically two types: comparisons between samples that represent different stages of foreign language development - <u>developmental performance analysis</u> [11]; and comparisons between either the learner's performance in his native and foreign language, or between the learner's foreign language performance and the performance of native speakers of the language in question - <u>contrastive performance analysis</u>. The PIF project plan to carry out both developmental and contrastive performance analyses.

One very tricky problem in connection with "contrastive performance analysis" has to do with what counts as the most adequate sample of the target language. There are at least two possibilities here:

1) a sample of language produced by native speakers as similar to the learners as possible; i.e. speakers who are the same age and have the same educational and social background as the learners

2) a sample of language produced by speakers who can be taken to represent the linguistic ideal towards which teachers attempt to push their pupils.

In other words: do we compare the English of Danish 12-year olds with the English of English 12-year olds? Or with the English spoken by a group of well-educated 30-year olds from the southern parts of Britain?

6. PIF - progress report

Material serving as a corpus for the project was collected in spring 1978 (cf. Færch MSb). 120 learners of English, divided into 12 groups representing different levels of the Danish educational system, produced the following types of texts:

1) an oral summary of a film, recorded in the language laboratory

2) a written summary of the same film

3) an essay in English on a set topic ("violence")

4) an essay in Danish on a set topic ("work")

5) a video-taped, 20 minute conversation with a native speaker of English.[12]

All tapes are transcribed as illustrated by the extract contained in appendix 1. Written texts are computerized and tagged with information about word classes and error types. At a later stage, information about select syntactic and paralinguistic features will be added. One immediate advantage of computerizing the material is that a number of linguistic performance analyses can be done quite easily. Thus it is possible to establish inter-language word lists, representing different developmental stages of interlanguage. It is easy to count different error types and to establish which types are persistent and which types only appear for a limited period of time. It is possible to count discrete linguistic phenomena, provided they can be delimited on the basis of orthographic and word-class information. Finally, co-occurrences of specific word classes and error types can be identified automatically by the computer.

The data we have collected so far allow us to make developmental performance analyses. As regards contrastive performance analyses between learners' Danish and their interlanguage, we can only base these on the essays, which is a serious limitation. It means, for instance, that we cannot contrast learners' oral production in Danish and English. One of the future tasks for the project will be to fill this gap. There is, in addition, an even wider gap, as we cannot at present make any large scale, contrastive analyses between interlanguage and target language. Hopefully, a parallel corpus of native English will be collected during 1979.

Appendix 2 contains a complete list of articles and reports produced by project workers in connection with the project.

7. PIF - pedagogical implications

The PIF project may contribute to the development of English teaching in Denmark within three areas:

1) By making linguistic performance analyses, rather than error analyses, we hope to draw teachers' attention away from errors towards other more positive aspects of learner language. One reason why teachers are liable to focus on errors rather than non-errors is probably that it is so much easier to "count errors" than to "measure success". Therefore we would like to develop methods of describing learners' performance which are easy to administer by teachers.[13] Communicative performance analyses may provide teachers with useful information with respect to the grading of language and with respect to which areas of language are most in need of being subjected to corrective feedback.

2) Our contrastive analyses between interlanguage and native English may reveal that native speakers of English exhibit much more variety in their use of language than teachers expect. And force teachers to think twice about the problem of "norms" in foreign language education. Contrastive analyses between the learner's performance in his mother tongue and the foreign language may reveal interesting correlations or dependencies (see, e.g. Stendahl 1972). Finally, contrastive performance analyses, supplemented with traditional contrastive analyses, may be used pedagogically to draw learners' attention to differences and

similarities between the mother tongue and the foreign language. Here, we should be careful not to discourage learners from making principled guessing on the basis of their L_1 knowledge - at least when we are dealing with two languages as closely related as Danish and English. Borrowing is often a fertile communication strategy.[14]

3) The developmental performance analyses should enable us to assess the relevance of a "universal" element in language learning in formal situations. The questions we would like to consider are the following: do all Danish learners follow the same path towards proficiency in English, though at different speeds? And if so, does this developmental pattern correlate with developmental patterns established with other groups of learners outside a Danish-speaking environment? If this should turn out to be the case, it would have far-reaching implications for the way a foreign language is both graded and presented to learners. But in order to get that far we need close, international cooperation, to ensure that the results we obtain for learners with different mother tongues do not differ simply as a function of differences in research design. The cooperation between Dutch - English and Polish - English projects at Utrecht and Poznań is a promising initiative in the right direction, to be extended with other projects representing different mothertongues.

Footnotes

1. The research reported in this communication is supported by a grant from the Danish Research Council for the Humanities.
2. The term 'traditional contrastive linguistics' is here used with reference to research in the tradition of Lado (1957) and the studies published under the auspicies of Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.
3. "Project in Error Analysis, Interlanguage Studies and Contrastive Linguistics", Department of English, University of Copenhagen, 84-96 Njalsgade, DK 2300 Copenhagen S.
4. See, e.g., the survey of CL contained in Rusiecki (1976).
5. Recent developments in theoretical linguistics have completely blurred the distinction between theoretical linguistics as a basic research discipline and sociolinguistics as an applied discipline. Chomsky's notion of 'explanatory adequacy' also presupposes a suspension of the dichotomy. For a related view with respect to foreign language pedagogy, see Corder (1978a).
6. The term 'foreign language pedagogy' can be considered an abbreviation of the more cumbersome 'studies in foreign language learning and teaching', corresponding to the German 'Sprachlehr- und Sprachlernforschung' (Bausch & Raabe 1978 pp.57ff.).
7. Needless to say, our population of 120 learners cannot be representative of the 12 levels. The learners were picked at random from schools and institutions in the Copenhagen area, and the most we can say is that out data represent what can actually be found within the Danish educational system. It will be up to teachers to decide to what extent our data can be considered representative of their particular pupils.
8. See references in Færch 1978b.
9. The relationship between analyses of the product level and the process level is represented schematically in Færch 1978a.
10. Discussed in Færch (MSa).
11. Developmental performance analyses may be carried out both on a longitudinal and on a cross-sectional basis.

12. An extract from one of the video recordings was shown as part of the presentation of this report.

13. Ranking high within this area are methods of describing oral performance, in particular fluency.

14. 'Borrowing' is here used, in opposition to 'transfer', about communication strategies (Corder 1978b).

References

Albrechtsen,D., B.Henriksen, C.Færch (MS). "Native Speaker Attitudes towards Learners' Spoken Interlanguage".

Bartsch,R. (1973). "Gibt es einen sinnvollen begriff von linguistischer komplexität?" Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik pp. 6-31.

Bausch , K.R. & H.Raabe (1978). "Zur Frage der Relevanz von kontrastiver Analyse, Fehleranalyse und Interimsprachenanalyse für den Fremdsprachenunterricht". Jahrbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache Band 4 pp. 56-75.

Bialystok,E. & M.Fröhlich (1977). Second Language Learning and Teaching in Classroom Settings: the Learning Study. The Modern Language Centre, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Corder,S.P. (1978a). "BAAL - the Next Ten Years". AILA Bulletin 1 pp. 39-41.

Corder,S.P. (1978b). "Language Learner Language" in Understanding Second and Foreign Language Learning ed. J.Richards. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

van Ek,J.A. (1975). The Threshold Level. Council of Europe.

Færch,C. (1978a). "Language Learning Studies" in Occasional Papers 1976-1977 ed. G.D.Caie et al. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.

Færch,C. (1978b). "Performance Analysis" in Papers from the Fourth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics ed. K.Gregersen. Odense: Odense University Press.

Færch,C. (MSa). Research in Foreign Language Pedagogy - the PIF Project. Anglica et Americana, Department of English. University of Copenhagen.

Færch,C. (ed.) (MSb). A Corpus of Learner Language. Anglica et Americana, Department of English, University of Copenhagen.

Hatch,E.M. (1978). "Discourse Analysis and Second Language Acquisition" in Second Language Acquisition ed. E.M.Hatch. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Howatt,A. (1974). "The Background to C se Design" in Edinburgh Course in Applied Linguistics vol. 3, ed. J.P.B.Allen & S.P. Corder. London: Oxford University Press.

Hunt,K.W. (1970). Syntactic Maturity in Schoolchildren and Adults. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, Serial No. 134, Vol.35 No. 1 February 1970, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Johansson,S. (1975). "A Methodological Study of the Communicative Effect of Learners' Errors" in Papers in Contrastive Linguistics and Language Testing ed. S.Johansson. Lund:CWK Gleerup.

Krashen,S.D. (1977). "The Monitor Model for Adult Second Language Performance" in Viewpoints on English as a Second Language ed. M.Burt, H.Dulay, M.Finocchiaro. New York Regent Publishing Company.

Lado,R. (1957). Linguistics across Cultures. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Mackey, W.F. (1973). "Language Didactics and Applied Linguistics" in Focus on the Learner ed. J.W.Olier & J.C.Richards. Rowley: Newbury House.

Marton,W. (1974). "Some Remarks on the Formal Properties of Contrastive Pedagogical Grammars" in Proceedings of the 3rd congress of AILA, Copenhagen 1972, vol 1: Applied Contrastive Linguistics. Heidelberg: Julius Groos.

Peck,S. (1978). "Child - Child Discourse in Second Language Acquisition" in Second Language Acquisition ed. E.M.Hatch. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Rusiecki,J. (1976). "The Development of Contrastive Linguistics". Interlanguage Studies Bulletin 1 pp. 12-44.

Sankoff,G. & S.Laberge (1974). "On the Acquisition of Native Speakers by a Language" in Pidgins and Creoles ed. D. de Camp & I.F.Hancock. Washington,D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Stendahl,K. (1972). The Relative Proficiency in Their Native Language and in English Shown by Swedish Students of English at University Level. SPRENG Report 6, English and Pedagogical Departments, University of Göteborg.

Wode,H. (1978). "The L_1 vs. L_2 Acquisition of English in Interrogation". Working Papers on Bilingualism 15 pp. 37-58.

Appendix 1:

(Track 1: interviewer. Track 2: learner.)

1	
2	and one brother - and - er- my big brother and my big sister eeerm is cleaning
3	
4	
5	

1	mm how old
2	man - but - my two little sisters is home and erm cleaning the house
3	
4	
5	

1	are they how old - are you mm
2	"hvadbehager" mm - I am "twølf" - thirteen -
3	
4	
5	

1	mm
2	"om" two months - my big brother is -- seventeen my sister is sixteen my
3	
4	
5	

1	do you clean every day
2	two little sisters is five and eleven year (dyb indin-
3	
4	
5	

Appendix 2:

Publications, reports etc. by members of PIF in connection with the project

Albrechtsen,D., B.Henriksen, C.Færch: "Native Speaker Attitudes towards Spoken Interlanguage". MS.

Evans,G. & K.Haastrup: "Experiments with Cloze Procedure". The English Language Teaching Journal 31.1 (1976) 35-41.

Færch,C. "Language Learning Studies" in Occasional Papers 1976-1977 ed. G.Caie et al. Copenhagen 1978: Akademisk Forlag.

Færch,C. "Performance Analysis" in Papers from the Fourth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics ed. K.Gregersen. Odense 1978: Odense University Press.

Færch,C. "Verbal Complementation in Danish, English, and the Interlanguage of Danish Learners of English". Paper presented at the 5th AILA Congress, Montreal 1978.

Glahn,E. "Introspection as a Method of Elicitation in Interlanguage Studies". Paper presented at the 5th AILA Congress, Montreal 1978.

Haastrup,K. "The Assessment of Oral Proficiency" in Papers on English Language Testing in Scandinavia ed. A.Zettersten. Anglica et Americana 1, Department of English, University of Copenhagen 1977.

Haastrup,K. & A.Zettersten: "A Select Bibliography of English Language Testing in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden" in Papers on English Language Testing in Scandinavia (see above). Copenhagen 1977.

Phillipson,R. "Diagnostic Testing of Spoken English" in Papers on English Language Testing in Scandinavia (see above). Copenhagen 1977.

Phillipson, R. " When It's Right to be Wrong". Sproglæreren 5, 1978.

Phillipson,R. "Prosody Errors in English Spoken by Danes" in "The Prosody of Nordic Languages", special issue of Publications of the Phonetics Department, University of Lund 1979.

Phillipson,R. "Tolerance Tests - Measuring the Linguistic and Communicative Content of Samples of Learner Language". To appear in Proceedings of the Goethe Institut/ British Council Seminar on Language Testing, Paris 1978. Munich: Goethe Institut.